

REVIEW

LIBRARY OF THE
* NOV 13 1900
OF THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Rev. John Watson's
(Tan Maclaren)

"Life of the Master"

As Published by

McClure's Magazine
(May, 1900, Etc.)

BY

EDWIN A. WILSON
SPRINGFIELD, ILL.

1903

BS2420
.W747

11.13.05

Library of the Theological Seminary

PRINCETON, N. J.

Division

52.1.12.7

Section

W74.7

REVIEW

OF

Rev. John Watson's

(Ian Maclaren)

"Life of the Master"

AS PUBLISHED IN

McCLURE'S MAGAZINE

(May 1900, Etc.)

BY

EDWIN A. WILSON

SPRINGFIELD, ILL.

1903.

"THE LIFE OF THE MASTER"

A REVIEW

There is but one authentic source from which to gather into story, anything that is helpful and trustworthy as "a life of the Master." The Sacred Scriptures contain all that is revealed of the Father concerning His Son, Jesus Christ. Any attempt of the imagination which undertakes to more than set forth the divine utterance in its relation to the Godman, is but a work of supererogation, and every effort to produce a life of our Lord which does not involve every line that is written of Him by the divine penman, and no more, is incomplete, misleading and satanic.

To write of Christ to edification, one needs to be Spirit-taught; the Spirit's channel of such communication to men is the Word; knowledge of and subjection to the Book of Books are essential elements in equipment for such service. A further condition precedent is faith in what must be admitted is above nature, and only to be apprehended by faith, as taught by the Spirit—revelation, not reason, the basis; any life of Jesus which does not honor the Sacred Writings by accounting for every phenomena in what is written, rather than in the imagination, comes short. If the advent of Jesus was planned in the councils of eternity, and the Holy Ghost has chronicled sufficient of the details in the sacred volume to give a connected history of "The Master," why does the Reverend gentleman proceed to mislead the popular reader by leaving out points of salient interest: First as it relates to an elemental thought of Him, as found in Gen. 3:15. "Her seed," or second, "Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a Son, and shall call His name Immanuel" (God with us). Is. 7:14. Third, "and behold thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a Son, and shall call His name Jesus; and the Holy

Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore also that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God." Luke 1:31-35. To pass by without notice what has been written concerning the origin and only explanation of the personal presence in the likeness of men; of One in whom so much of intense interest has centered for time and eternity, is criminal. It banishes to the domain of uncertainty and unreliability every line written by this reverend doctor.

Dr. John Watson's language, it is readily confessed, is most chaste and elegant, his imagery is charming, but when he becomes a mere romancer and indifferently invades the sacred precincts of divinity, he becomes a factor for evil and not for good. In his efforts to furnish pabulum for the popular taste, he reads his own misconceptions into the divine revelation, while should he confine himself to the ancient and honored Record, the Holy Scriptures, he would at once lose what he is seeking, the applause of men.

We are not then surprised at the low plane of the merely human, upon which he bases his opening thoughts concerning "The Master." Authority and accuracy are the dual pillars which must support a fabric that is to be symmetrical and substantial. If the Bible then is not his only source of information and literal lines followed in its transcription, his whole life of the Master is an unworthy production. Error in one part suggests inaccuracy everywhere; if he accepts the teaching on one page of the Bible, and rejects that of another part, he presumes to sit in judgment upon it all, and hence is unfitted to discuss any part of this wonderful Record. To add to what is written is as reprehensible as to take from what is written. Luke 2:9 says "and the angel of the Lord came upon them, and the glory of the Lord shone round about them," but nowhere

does the sacred historian say "and a star rested above Bethlehem." Matthew does, however, say "and the star which they saw in the east went before them till it came and stood over where the young child was." The annunciation sent the shepherds to Bethlehem in haste, where they found Mary, Joseph and the babe, according to Luke.

But He was circumcised on the eighth day and His name called Jesus according to Luke, and in harmony with Lev. 12:3, thirty-three days after He was presented to the Lord, in the Temple, at Jerusalem; hence we know from Luke 2:39, that after this, when the babe Jesus was perhaps forty-two or three days old, they went to their own city, Nazareth, and not again to Bethlehem's manger.

Matthew and Luke give the place of nativity. The wise men led by the star came in search of the newly born King of the Jews. We do not know how many wise men, from whence they came, or their names. We know that the star stood over where the young child was; where this was we are not told, save that it was in a house (Matt. 2:11); but we know that Herod basing his conclusions upon what he had learned of the wise men (Matt. 2:16) slew all the children from two years old and under in Bethlehem and the coasts thereof.

The wise men did not seem to do homage to the babe of Luke, but to the child of Matthew. The visits of the shepherds and that of the wise men must have occurred at different times and places."

It might be accepted as good logic that the beautiful in almost any lad's life might be readily traced to his mother, and to wise men in halls of learning; not so, however, would this be true in the case of the child Jesus, who, at the age of twelve years, was not only at home in His Father's house, but about His Father's business, and absolutely untrammelled as the son of God by any human relationship.

We note with pleasure, and commend as praiseworthy, Dr. Watson's tribute to the Book, which all might profitably heed, wherein he says "For Jesus there could be only one book, but it was the best." For the nonce divesting himself of the taint of higher criticism the Doctor here indites a commendable word for the Book of Deuteronomy.

Dr. Watson's tribute to labor as he finds it exemplified in the carpenter, deserves more than a passing word, though he persists in lowering the exalted standard, from the divine to the human, as he traces much of the grandeur and loveliness he beholds in this wonderful Saviour to His home and mother.

Again as He came forth in response to the divine call, it is no where affirmed that He came to establish the Kingdom, even though the ambitious mother of Zebedee's children sought the best places for her sons. Jesus was born King, His lineage in Matthew is traced to prove him Kingly, a King indeed, but without a Kingdom, a King, but in rejection. The Apostles were looking for place and preference in it, but like many others of that and this day, including the reverend doctor, they were not in this respect taught of God; the Apostles looked into His sweet face, beheld His miracles, and even after His resurrection were as "fools and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets had spoken." The dying thief was better equipped than our author; his fund of Kingly lore surpassed that of the great Scottish teacher, for as a thief hanging by His side, he recognized Jesus as the coming King, and prayed to be remembered when He should come in His Kingdom. Jesus' first coming to the earth was with reference to the question of sin (Matt. 1-21). His second coming to the earth will be in connection with the Kingdom, not as the Lamb which taketh away the sin of the world, but as the Lion of the tribe of Judah exercising Kingly prerogatives in His

omnipotence, which rights they refused Him when He came in weakness, poverty and humiliation (John 1:10-11).

These popular taking articles of Dr. Watson in McClure's are possessed of great literary merit, but they are failures as moulders of right thoughts of God; unreliable in inference and assertion, and found by careful analysis to be mere figments of a diseased brain, very poorly illustrating the reputed knowledge of the Word of this eminent Scot, hence Dr. Watson's readable lines are full of pitfalls, and to the uninstructed, fraught with great danger; 95 per cent. of the un-Spirit taught will accept what is written as truth, and will not subject to careful, painstaking comparison Dr. Watson's words with the Words of the Holy Ghost.

The advent of our Lord was in absolute harmony with what was written aforetime, and Dr. Watson's insinuations to the contrary proves how poorly he has gathered the mind of the Spirit who has fully transcribed the details of His birth as to time, place and circumstances, involving the Virgin Mother with sufficient particularity to enable the Chief Priests and scribes to satisfy the wicked Herod.

Dr. Watson's eloquent tribute to the sovereignty of God as he traces the prophets to Him, causes a regret for presuming to offer a criticism of the writings of this eminent man; but he descends from the sublime to the ridiculous when he tells us that the mouth of Zacharias was open that he might call him John, when the converse is true. for we read, "when he had written 'His name is John,' his mouth was opened immediately, and his tongue was loosed, and he spake and praised God." Luke 1:63-64. The reverend John Watson cannot be relied upon when he is found thus corrupting the Word; his fancy plays with the truth; subjection to what is written and all that is written furnishes the necessary fitness for witnessing for God in time and eternity.

The Bible's author says "there was a man sent from God whose name was John." Any word painting in derogation of this testimony is unworthy of consideration: when we learn whence John came, we are prepared to believe John's words, "I saw and bear record that this is the Son of God." John taught of God was qualified to recognize the Son of God, not otherwise. Dr. Watson would have us believe that John used to tremendous advantage his eyes, ears, feet, solitude, heart and mind, as he made them do duty in tracing out the God man, while John traces it all to the Father; for John was neither misled by sunshine or shadow (John 1:33). Dr. Watson agrees with Henry Drummond in his misleading teaching, when he says "that the inspiration of nature must make less obscure the inspiration of Revelation." Dr. Watson carries other perverse marks to indicate his sympathies in the field of higher criticism. His references to the two Isaiah's prove him "wise above that which is written." John looked for Jesus at the Jordan, and at His Baptism, and found Him in harmony with what is written. John's knowledge of God's mind, and His practical application of God's inerrant rule, resulted in his recognition of, and testimony concerning Jesus, as God's Lamb, "which taketh away the sin of the world." John arrogates nothing to himself, his simple faith was honored of God, and God honoring: he was but a voice repeating what he had heard. It was not a vision of the soul after the Spirit, he was not arrested by the visible holiness of Jesus, and thus identified Him with the Christ; not his fine spiritual conception, nor the inherent glory of Jesus, but the application of the truth of God the Father, to the Person of God the Son, in the one place of the Jordan, and in the singular act of baptism. John's imagination played no part in the recognition of God's Son, for he had the word of God, which with John was all sufficient. Jesus was proved divine, John as heaven sent. There

were but two elements involved in John's baptism, the fulfillment of all righteousness, and the manifestation of Jesus to Israel. (Matt. 3: 15; John 1:31.

Doctor John Watson links the name of Jesus with all that is worth remembering in connection with the lovely villages in which he wrought and taught in the Holy Land, and he tells us, no matter how prosperous or famous a town might be, that, unless Jesus honored it with his presence, it could have no place in sacred history. But the reviewer is not disposed to offer criticism concerning any mere extravagance of utterance, which seems to characterize Dr. Watson, so long as he is found to be in harmony with what is written in the sacred volume. However, where the Holy Spirit is silent, man may well be dumb, with feet and head bare, for the ground on which he treads is holy ground. There are full too many flagrant departures from the truth to occupy our time upon what might be considered mere trivialities.

In the consideration of this section we come to Jesus at the Jordan. At John's baptism, according to Dr. Watson, in the sinners' place. Jesus, the Lamb of God, spotless and impeccable, now manifested to Israel, through John's baptism, was without sin, though in all points tempted as we are—for it is here that God the Father confesses Him as one in whom He is well pleased, which He could not do if Jesus had sin in Him or on Him. This was also true on the Holy Mount, when Jesus spoke of His exodus, which he would shortly accomplish at Jerusalem; for the Father audibly owned Him, in whom He was still well pleased. There came a time when our sins were laid on Him, for the Lord laid on him the iniquity of us all. "He was delivered for our offenses." On that dark night when Jesus said to Judas, "This is your hour, and the power of darkness;" then the satan-filled traitor was to do his worst. For the time is fast approaching when Jesus is to be numbered with

the transgressors, "bear our griefs, carry our sorrows, be stricken, smitten, afflicted, wounded for our transgressions, bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, with His stripes we are healed;" the Lord is to lay on Him the iniquity of us all, to bruise Him, put Him to grief, make His soul an offering for sin, for He is to pour out His soul unto death, to bear the sins of many, made to be sin. He is to bear our sins in His own body on the tree. Once and once only was He to be offered to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself. Christ, our true passover, is to be sacrificed for us; the culminating moment is hastening with rapid stride, for He is to be made a curse for us, for it is written, "cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree." Gal. 3:13. His atoning work began and ended at Calvary; the darkness and terror of this awful hour betokened the averted face of the Father, when the Son was forsaken by God.

Here the crisis was reached, somewhere in time, between the compassionate prayer of a suffering Saviour, "Father forgive them for they know not what they do," and the despairing, agonizing cry, "My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me."

Jesus bore our sins. It was the sin on the sinless One, that shrouded into darkness the noonday sun, that rent the veil of the temple in twain; that made the earth to quake and the rocks to rend. Jesus condescended to the sinners' place, whom He came to save. It was in accord with the wiles of the devil from the beginning to attack the Word of the Father, whether in Eden or the wilderness. He found weakness in the first Adam, he looked for it in the last Adam who came from the Jordan with the benediction of the Father, full of the Holy Ghost. Satan could not shake the confidence of the Son in the Word of the Father.

How precious to contemplate One, who, stooping from the divine height to the limitless depth into which sin had brought depraved man,

and then could yet touch without taint every condition of the sinner, as He sought to woo and win him; tempted that He might sympathize with the woman accused by the Pharisees, in John eight, while in faithfulness He rebuked her accusers; that He might deal in tenderness with poor, self-reliant, Lord-denying Peter, as he appoints time and place for a meeting on the resurrection side of the tomb.

In the temptations of our Lord, as recorded in Matthew and Luke, it is true that satan's first temptation was directed through the body of our Lord. Humanly speaking, had He been but man, He had been most susceptible, but His personality had the marks of Godhood: these, John instructed of the Father, recognized: Jesus had been in no spiritual trance. His were the perfections of manhood, the fullness of the God-man—a consciousness that never found Him off His guard. No surprise ever awaited Him. Jesus chooses from his own armory weapons offensive and defensive, "it is written," must suffice; the foe is from without, whether it be the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, or the pride of life, for from within there is no response, nothing to fit the case.

Dr. Watson gives expression to lofty sentiments in the following elegant, though obscure way: "Is not the very heart of religion faith in God, a faith so unreserved, so truthful and loving, that it will leave the person absolutely in the presence of God?" But our writer, who abounds in aphorisms, is so handicapped by his environments that he will not allow the fifth book of Moses to furnish the sole and only defense used by our Lord in His conflict with the evil one. One could bear with the author of "The Life of the Master" in his sublime rhapsodies as to the divinity of our Lord, if he did not persistently deal with the divine as if it were merely human; we might soar in ecstatic joy with the eloquent Scotchman, did we not find him in the realm of fancy, rather than faith,

affecting to be occupied with a high type of manhood, while dealing with the only true conception of Godhood. We do not hesitate to affirm again that any life of our Lord other than the inspired Word is utterly untrustworthy; to substitute a man's imagination is to mar all, and is an affront to the Author, God; to account for God's unique acting on the low plane of mere man is God dishonoring, and unworthy a place in so-called Christian literature.

Dr. Watson's third paper transcends the previous ones in weakness; the relationships suggested are absurd in the extreme; that of Mary and Salome is puerile, and furnishes no clue to the child of faith as to how the one John became the disciple of the other. The words quoted by the doctor as introducing John to Jesus are weak and silly; John presents Jesus to Israel in words most memorable and by the Spirit's power soul convincing. "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world," these are too tame for the doctor. It is not purity and sacrifice which saves the world; this is a mere glittering generality. The Kingdom had not begun; the very opposite is proven, for when the crowd witnessed His miracles and would come by force and make Him King, He withdrew to the mountain alone.

There is no warrant in the Scripture to base an argument "that almost every man could be reached by reason." The Pharisees reasoned among themselves and continued in alienation from God. There is but one way to reach man, that is God's way in the gospel; there is only one way to reach God, faith in Jesus Christ—"neither is there salvation in any other." Jesus knew the issue of reasoning and rebuked it; of faith, and commended it. The way into the Kingdom of God pointed out to Nicodemus by Jesus is the new birth; the way of salvation to the characterless Samaritan is to drink of the water of life; Nicodemus and the woman at the well confronted obstacles that only faith, not

reason, could overcome; Jesus could find no whit more upon which to build in the Ruler of the Jews than in the Samaritan adultress.

But Mr. Watson with his reason would trace the issue of the new creation to "lasting and spiritual friendship:" what fallacy, how misleading, how soul-destroying, are Dr. Watson's homilies.

Again, Jesus entered so to speak His official course at the Jordan, not at Cana of Galilee, as assumed by Dr. Watson. The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God (Mark 1:1) John and the Jordan, the voice of the Father, the baptism of water, and of the Holy Ghost, these are familiar to the Bible student and associated together at the very threshold of the official life of Jesus the Anointed One.

Dr. Watson, as usual, loses sight of the only authority for basing an argument, and introduces his own ideas in place of the Word, weaving with malice prepense, out of whole cloth, line after line, misleading any one foolish enough to come to him for instruction, for he spins out of his fertile brain, without a warrant in the Word, things hidden to all but himself: he tells us that the Mother of Jesus and family had removed to Cana, refers with flagrant presumption to the elder brothers of Jesus to account for the bride of Cana as absurdly related to the Lord; rudely thrusting fancy into the face of fact; speaks of the pleasant traffic between Jesus and the children of Nazareth but lately removed to Cana, and so fills out a purely Watsonian conception; tells of Jesus flinging some gay word to these children as they loitered by His door. How worse than absurd not to say profane, to speak of the erstwhile little maid as the child of Jesus' elder brother, and the bride of Cana's wedding feast, and this with rude effrontery, in the face of the facts as found in Luke.

Behold, also, the strong corroborative proof of the fallacy of this infamous mis-statement of Dr. Watson as seen in Luke 2:7, "and she

brought forth her first born Son." Thus the preacher attacks the citadel of the divine in the life of our Lord, and seeks to place Him side by side with His brethren, all younger than He, but who, according to John seven, did not believe in Him, and were like the world about them (John 7:5-7). Presumably this feast of Cana furnishes an opportunity for the worldly taught Scotchman to bring in the inspiration of nature, and in a deft application of it, eliminate some of the so-called obscurities of the inspiration of Revelation. Such fiction is accepted by men as more reasonable than faith, and in haste they turn away from the truth of God: led captive by satan at his will, they plunge heedlessly into the whirlpool of error, find no pleasure in the profound and beautiful, but revel in the gross, misleading vaporings of men who call themselves reverends and doctors, but who yet with silly pride, in ignorance become blind leaders of the blind.

Dear reader do not permit yourself to accept anything about the Word of God which is not found in the Word of God. Man is incapable of adding to or taking from the Word of God without debasing the creature and dishonoring the Creator: no work of God is incomplete in any sense. If Dr. Watson can add to it with profit or take from it in wisdom, not a line of it is worth considering. Not a word from Genesis to Revelation worthy a moment's thought. If any man living can make less obscure the Book of Revelation by the application of reason through the sin beclouded church, or by the introduction of natural law into the domain of the spiritual world, then discard the whole without hesitation. There was but one way for Abel and Abraham: Moses and Elias: Peter and Paul; this was the way of faith, with God its Author and finisher, "For without faith it is impossible to please Him."

Increased privileges and extended opportunities add ever increasingly to our responsibili-

ties. It may be much short of the truth to say that the Rev. John Watson, in his "Life of the Master," has not less than a million readers. Not one-thousandth part of these can be called discriminating Bible students, nearly, if not all, accepting indifferently any religious writing without hesitation and without question; not one hundred subjecting the magazine fiction to anything like such a critical comparison with the Bible as would reveal the contrast between the truth and a lie. This is one of the many proofs of alienation to God among men. Perhaps nowhere is this so apparent among classes as is found among the ordinary church membership; the legitimate issue of the seeds of error sown broadcast in the world but constituting the the world's estimate of truth because of its environments. Reverend and doctor being synonymous with, though very far, often, from the Christian's only text book, and this will continue so long as pious lies are found more and more readable and attractive; no disintegrating wedge has ever operated so disastrously in separating the Christian from the Bible, as the class of lies represented by "Cyrus," and the genus of writers of the Shelden stamp. Any religious book, magazine or article which becomes more fascinating to the Christian than the Bible, is a curse, and proves itself of satanic origin, no matter who the human author may be.

Popular articles of this class are of ever increasing interest to a careful observer; for the reason that first impressions are here made for weal or woe; it is infinitely easier to secure a good crop from virgin soil than to reap with joy the seed of one's sowing in a field pre-empted by weeds. A humble reviewer of what is ostensibly a good book, lays himself open to criticism and principally because with the many tinsel is accepted for gold. The authenticity of sundry drama and poetry is considered a legitimate field for discussion, but to insist that much that is dubbed religious is devilish, shocks the sensibil-

ities of many who claim to be religious, but who know nothing of God or the Bible. Magazine articles of late years have made more familiar than ever the great ones in history; the names of Cromwell, Napoleon and others have become in a sense common to many men and women who knew little of them from the historic pages. Behold how ready the writers of the day are to criticise any departure from what are considered the facts of history; all have the same data to draw from, but some are disposed to make more of trivialities than others. Herein is the trend of the age seen, writers and readers accepting without hesitation anything and everything written in the past of the world's celebrities, while hesitating on the threshold of Truth to accept what was written aforetime for our learning in the Book of God; and much more fully attested through time by men who have put its promises to the test, than any work of man down through the ages.

"The Life of the Master" can get its conception from one source only, just one Book; a hated Book, a neglected Book, a rejected Book. If the "Life of the Master" was divested of the fanciful, while given in the simple language of the Sacred Scriptures, which would give it all the marks of truth and genuineness, it would be no more popular than the Book it claims to issue from. All found in the old Book is truth, anything added to "what is written" is false. Though "truth is stranger than fiction," yet is invention prized the more. Where thousands might read the Bible in even a cursory way, without a wrong impression, hundreds of thousands preferring fancy, are misled by the half truths as uttered by such writers and preachers as Dr. Watson.

Our writer says "Jesus was born in Bethlehem, He was educated in Nazareth, He was crucified at Jerusalem. In a general way this is true, and yet we are told, as if he were dealing with the life of a mere man, that "in none of

these arrangements had He any voice." What misleading, soul-destroying nonsense. No common man—accepted idea—can be introduced with reference to the God-man; no human language adequately expresses the truth about Jesus Christ save as it is written by inspiration of God. To picture Jesus Christ as a puppet, so handicapped by weakness as to be at the mercy of man, is the veriest presumption: not one thing is known of Him for twelve years from His birth; a glimpse at Him then reveals His Godhood, and another eighteen years passes without a word of Him, when he is introduced as the Son of God, and equal with God; His subjection at Nazareth was in harmony with His obedience to the cruel tree and to death, and never an indication of weakness. Had He chosen He could have arrested the opposition to Him and the culmination of that conspiracy in the garden. Jesus did what no other man ever did. He forgot Himself; He was at Bethlehem, at Nazareth, at Jerusalem, because it was written of Him; He had a will, but not against God, for He was God. The parts He acted were planned with Himself in council in eternity, and while He was recognized as the sent One, it is true, also, that He came out from God, and wrought for God in every act, whether in subjection in life or in triumphing over death. He came with an intelligent apprehension of whence and why He came, and the work He came to do—"Lo, I come to do Thy will, O God." The infinite for the moment might be obscured by what appeared to be but finite, yet it was God acting throughout, after the council of His own will.

Dr. Watson admits that for three years or so he could arrange His life as he pleased; does he forget that Jesus had all the marks of manifest Godhood at His birth when worshipped by angels, by shepherds and by the wise men? Did not Simeon, long waiting for the consolation of Israel, witness to His divinity as he made ready to depart, when at forty days of age Jesus was

revealed to him by the Holy Ghost in the temple, as manifestly as He was identified through John at the Jordan by God the Father and God the Holy Ghost? Does the language of Simeon indicate that he held but a helpless babe in his arms? Instructed ones found in Him all "the brightness of (God's) glory, and the express image of His Person." Dr. Watson may or may not admit that at the age of twelve He was the arbiter of His own action, tho' still in the place of weakness and apparent subjection, tho' at His own volition, possessed of power without limitations; for He was maker, upholder and owner of the universe of God, yet He voluntarily chose poverty's vale. He had power, He exercised it for all but Himself. It is infinitely more sensible and more reasonable to reject all "that is written" as the veriest bosh than to tamper with the message of God. How chapter and verse will rise up as the veriest goblins to these men who, unwisely and officiously corrupt the Word with their own small minds. The writer of this simple review would rather drop into a nameless grave in some dishonored part of God's acre, than to inject his meagre mind into the mind of God as it is found written upon the page of God. The great God is not an intangible essence, but an intelligent personality—who says what He means and means what He says.

Dr. Watson speaks of Christ's first act of freedom as involving the choice of a city, in which to fix upon for the sphere of His labor and the centre from which He would evangelize. According to our learned doctor, Jesus was possessed of the attractive force of a state fair, or had the elements of popularity possessed by the site of a modern western county seat. The presumption is, according to his short-sighted, self-engendered theory that they had their respective committees and all sorts of arguments were advanced, together with a premium for the favor that Jesus stood ready to bestow upon the locality which could offer the greatest inducements.

How God dishonoring, how absurd; for such a travesty of the truth to issue from the lips of a reverend is appalling; not a word in all the Book indicates a movement on the part of any town or city to induce Jesus to make His home there. Nazareth, where He was brought up, drove Him from their synagogue and city on the occasion, probably, of His first sermon, which, but for His superhuman power had ended His career. (Luke 4:28-29.)

No one knows why He chose and called Capernaum His own city, exalted in privilege by His presence, and blessed through His miracles, this city of His choice, who showed less appreciation than Sodom and Gomorrah had they been so blessed; mentioned in all the gospels sixteen times only, and yet Jesus appreciated His privileges in His own city so little that He would not accept the place as one of her children, but preferred as a stranger to pay tribute, and they appreciated Him less than He did them in asking Peter if his Master did not pay tribute. (Matt. 17:24-27.) Jerusalem never wanted Him, never bid for His coming, formed a conspiracy early in His brief official life so that He could not walk in Jewry, for the Jews sought to kill Him (John 7:1); not a reason is assigned by our blessed Lord for choosing Capernaum; almost every argument introduced in this pretended life of the Master is based upon shallow subterfuge, to the utter disgust of every man, woman and child who reads and believes what is in the Bible.

We are told that Jerusalem was to be His by the conquest of the cross; divested of the silliness of such a sentence we ask how can men commit such sacrilege apparently in the name of the Lord? Jerusalem hated Him, conspired against Him, slew Him; they called Him Beelzebub while He lived and He blessed them. They traced His power and compassionate use of that power to the devil, and after His ignominious death they referred to Him as "that deceiver." (Matt. 27:63.) So far as we know He

did not pass a night in Jerusalem, save the part of one, perhaps, when arrested and brought by force from Gethsemane to Annas. "He came unto His own (possessions) and His own (people) received Him not." He was born in Judea, but became a Galilean by adoption; but neither had a place nor a welcome for Him.

The reviewer's path is sometimes a thorny one, his purposes not understood; his intentions, whatever he may avow, misconstrued. A review of "The Life of the Master" is found interesting or otherwise in proportion to the interest had in the theme, and the time given to its consideration. A glance at the review or a superficial examination of the original subject is of little value. What we have before us purports to comprehend the life of the God man, Christ Jesus; if it comes short of that which the caption involves, it is of little worth; neither the name of the writing nor the fame of the writer can save it from obloquy. The reviewer would not bring his bias to warp his vision as he scans the pages of this popular story, but without prejudice he would gather any gems prone upon the surface or hidden beneath the word painting which may enfold them. The impressions made in the review of this wonderfully worded series, with its false and true statements, have been varied—surprise, pain, admiration, sorrow and disgust have clamored for recognition as Dr. Watson's lines have been examined. The reader is not advised to reject "The Life of the Master" as untrustworthy, until he has subjected the same to a careful comparison with that which "is written" and found it so. If these simple reviews will drive men to the application of God's inerrant scale, which will surely test the value of these papers, he will have accomplished his purpose, otherwise they will have little worth.

One can but glance at the word pictures as painted by this master in rhetoric, in fiction, charming; in history, misleading; in inspiration, profane. It will be impossible to consider in de-

tail this travesty upon truth in our limited space. The purpose is to test by the only correct rule what is found in glancing here and there. If our writer was a common every day man the world would accept it as a figment of the imagination and pass on unimpressed by it, he might read his great fund of fiction into the divine Record and furnish no surprise to any one, he might adventure rough shod into the circumscribed limits of God's domain where He (God) is pleased to tread alone, and no one would say Him nay; but our reverend writer, in a certain sense presumes to stand for God, and his office and subject, in a certain way cause his utterances to be accepted as authoratative, his vantage ground thus assured causes him to appear to the uninstructed as God's oracle.

Men were in alienation to God, and Jesus came to make peace with God, to establish a basis for atonement; through His death and resurrection, Jesus did not stoop to the sinner's place to white-wash-him, and apply some semi-christianizing, humanizing, civilizing process, which might appear to men to lift some nearer to God than others; but His coming, His dying, His rising, was to lift men out of the awful mess into which through sin they had fallen. God's purpose in renewing man was to cause him to conform to the image of His Son (Rom. 8:29). This explains the presence of the sinless One among sinners; without Him all was lost, with Him the two classes were seen in bold relief, saved and lost, reconciled and unreconciled, all the latter lost. Some knew it; the ninety and nine secure in their ignorance and self-righteousness, but when Jesus came they could have no cloak for their sin. The popular idea, and probably that held by our Scotch author, involves a bloodless atonement; it originated with Peter, and is of the devil (Mark 8:31-33). It does not require a heresy hunter to detect marks of discipleship in this school of error, when he says, "when a Jew desires to express his dislike of any

man with whose theology he does not agree, he calls him a Samaritan, just as people of our day are apt to call any teacher a Unitarian who does not hold their theory of atonement." Why atonement forsooth? if he were not supersensitive along these lines. The honest searcher after truth, loyal to what he finds in the only book which can intelligently deal with the question, will accept no man's theory, when the Holy Scriptures tell us "He was delivered for our offenses, and raised again for our justification" (Rom. 4:25) he believes no departure possible either in faith, precept or practice from the testimony of God, when we read "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures.

These simple passages are unanswerable, and corrupting theories of the Word of God cannot be accepted even though it shocks the divines. Dr. Watson tells us that Jesus was of pure Jewish blood: it is admitted that if Jesus was not a Jew by birth, he was by circumcision; but humanly speaking Jesus was no more a Jew than was Timothy, whose father was a Greek. The nationality comes from the father, not the mother; His Father was God, from whence the purely divine, not Jewish strains issued; most likely His visage or garb betokened Him a Jew. The woman of Samaria recognized Him as one by His speech, or in some such way, but it cannot be said that He was of pure Jewish blood. Incidentally He is proven a Jew in "coming to His own" (see also Rom. 9:5) but pure strains are sought in the sire; of Himself He could say "I proceeded forth and came from the Father." God was His Father, Jesus His only begotten Son, hence the language used has no foundation in fact: besides while He had all the marks of Godhood, He got through Joseph His ostensible father, His nationality from Abraham, His kingship from David. Could His human descent be traced in the face of what is written through Joseph and Mary, He could not be said to be of pure Jewish blood, which Dr. Watson could easily know had he taken time

to examine the record, for we know that He was, humanly speaking, of Jewish, Gentile, lowly, holy, royal, perfect, imperfect, mortal, immortal descent. He could trace His lineage by name through two Jewesses, two Gentiles, two harlots, and added to these an adulteress, which brought Him after nature from the lowest state of human society, but He could trace with ease His true place into God's family, even as a man, and to Godhood at the Jordan and the Holy Mount. While as God He became a compassionate Saviour, as man, His human relationship brought Him in touch with sin and shame.

Again we are misled by our learned, man-taught writer, as to the Samaritan problem; he tells us the Samaritan was too much in evidence to be ignored. How so? The record disproves it. Samaria; Samaritan and its plural, occur in the gospels but thirteen times; some of these are repetitions. The woman of Samaria, the Samaritan leper and He of Luke ten, are the only personal references, they rarely, if ever, intruding upon our Lord. The leper got cleansing and thanked Him; the woman of Sychar heard His message and received it. His own unique service in the world He exemplified in the other: yet in passing from Judea, "He must needs go through Samaria," intruding His own blessed presence upon those whom Jews with the purest blood despised as Gentile dogs. Yet, with all, the doctor is touchingly tender, as he links Jesus of Nazareth with the hated Samaritan: and still the doctor is bound to be a misleader in sacred things; at Jacob's well amidst its hallowed precincts, he seeks to leave impressions for which he has no warrant,—edifying here, misleading there, thus never reliable; for in grouping these two elements as of a common Father, he would teach the deceiving heresy of the Fatherhood of God. Speaking of the illiberality of the Jew in his hatred of the Samaritan, he says "why in the name of God and reason should he rail at his brother?" for beneath all the diversities of the

race and creed lies the deeper unity of human brotherhood." Human brotherhood, not one but two incongruous parts at the beginning, the one in alienation headed by Eve's first born son, Cain, the other by Abel, the man of faith. These diverse elements have been dominated by good on the one hand and evil on the other to the present. The Fatherhood of God embracing only such as have been introduced into God's family through faith in Jesus Christ: the other in alienation to God, of their father the devil; the one exemplified by the pure, unselfish, gentle, Christ-like woman missionary in inland China, the other by the ignorant, blood-thirsty Boxer, who would, in ignorance and hate, murder and defile her; or in the greed-getting Englishman's invasion of South Africa, with as deep but more intelligent hate, to kill and destroy in a more modern warfare, his professedly Christian brother, the Boer.

Dr. Watson belittles dogma, quotes Jesus as indifferent to doctrine, while despising ritual, charging that He suffered persecution because He would not come to terms with religious society. If dogma involves authoritative utterance, "never man spake like this man." "He spoke as one having authority." See John 3:36, 5:24, 6:47.

As to ritual, He proved Himself a Jew in conformity to its requirements as a babe, child, man, meeting every demand of the law; circumcised the eighth day, keeping the Passover His last night. It was not dogma nor ritual, but hypocrisy which separated our Lord from the Pharisees. He came to save, not to consort with all the diverse religionists of the day to prove His breadth, nor to pamper their pride by lauding their empty traditions. If they wanted anything of Him they could learn it at His feet, as sinners; but they refused the gift of eternal life, while the common people heard Him gladly.

Again we are told, without scriptural authority, that Jesus passed by the respectable in

Jericho, and passed the night with Zaccheus, a statement which might pass unnoticed if the same measure of mis-statement did not characterize almost every utterance of this Scotch Doctor of Divinity. He speaks of men being perplexed with Jesus; perplexed because rebuked in faithfulness by the One who could read the heart; there was no perplexity but that which issued from unbelief; there was no perplexity with Mary of Bethany; there may have been with the rich young Ruler. There was no room for perplexity where there was receptivity; religious bigots despised Him; sin sick sinners needing compassion received it.

Our Doctor in one of his flights pays a sweet tribute to Jesus as He turns sinners to saints, a beautiful gleam of white light amidst many shadows, but uninstructed in the Word, untaught by the Spirit, he continues to handle the Word of God deceitfully as he refers to Jesus and the Pharisees. Jesus calls them whitened sepulchres, denounced them while sitting in Moses' seat and binding burdens on men which they would not move with one of their fingers. Yet we are told that they were not bad, but simply looked at things from a different standpoint. He tells us that one day when the critics were especially severe, Jesus seized the occasion and made His great apologia in the fifteenth of Luke. In this connection Jesus is made to say that "the sinners were certainly waste and dangerous stuff * * * but it was culpable waste, the result of imperfect religious processes," but nowhere is Jesus found to give expression to such sentiments. Jesus did not regard them as mere integral parts of the body politic, dangerous to its peace, needing to be civilized and christianized for the sake of the community. Jesus never referred to them as a dangerous class because of their disposition to prey upon others, or likely to become a curse to any but themselves.

Religion operated in Jesus' day as an insuperable obstacle in the way of reconciliation to

God; sinners saw through it and refused it. No processes can operate to elevate men nearer to God than that which is involved in their birth, born after the flesh, children of wrath, born after the Spirit, children of God; the gift of God is eternal life, not religion. The more religion men get, the more radically they become what Dr. Watson calls "dangerous stuff."

The Master is said to make His appeal through reason, and yet His presence in the world, His methods were all above reason and not susceptible of being understood on any hypothesis suggested by man. He never asked for men's support, never appealed to men to stand by Him or approve Him; what He did ask was that they would come to Him, receive Him not because His view was most fitting, but because they were lost without Him; He never made a defense of Himself or His principles, or offered an apology for His action.

The silly twaddle about the prodigal has the merit of originality. He came back neither honest, humble nor penitent; among the swine in his hunger, wretchedness and filth he remembered three things—his father's hired servants, abundance of bread accessible to them, and his perishing condition, followed by a three-fold purpose as to where he would go, what he would do, and say, what he would be; the height of his ambition being to get into his father's house, and with his father's servants, that he might get the bread which they had, and to spare. Not a thought above his poor empty stomach: he was not looking for a son's place, but a servant's place; while the father was occupied with the son, just as he was; knew what was in his heart, but was longing to provide the kiss, the robe, the ring, the shoes: there was no opening for his son among the servants, but there was in his father's heart. All this is the Father's provision in grace, not the reward of merit, neither is it a romance as the doctor would have it, but the Spirit's testimony of a certain man

with two sons, repeated by our Lord to the Pharisees, who stood unmoved so far as the record goes. No softer, no more tender, no kinder feelings, they hated Him without a cause, they were unmoved by His faithfulness, they rejected, despised, slew Him. Jesus had never followed the story of the prodigal's father, with Luke sixteen had a change been wrought in His enemies.

The Scotch doctor is an inventive genius, abounds in originalities, perhaps nowhere does he reach his climacteric in the absurd as in connection with the woman of John eight, and the selection of a publican as one of the twelve, he introduces his readers to St. Mary Magdalene. Dr. Watson is not symmetrical: his disposition to fly off at tangents and to follow abnormal lines in the discussion of the wonderful character he professes to write of, shows him but poorly taught in the Word.

The realm of an imagination, inflamed by a loose rein thrown to the conscience, with slack conceptions of the Divine in inspiration, coupled with a moral judgment, untutored by the Spirit, is an unsafe and an unsound place into which scholars in God's school may be safely introduced. Let the Bible be divested of its sanctity: let vain foolish man imagine that he may invade its sacred precincts without marring its symmetry and beauty with his silly utterances: for if you would bring God's book down to the level where man has been a factor in its production, then you at once rob it of its grandeur and majesty.

Rev. John Watson at his pleasure drops from its wonderful pages its noblest utterances and in turn injects into its lovely confines, his own silly details, which mars the whole and reacts upon himself, though it may cause him to contemplate with pride the improvements he thinks he has wrought, while the faithful Bible student, with increasing sadness, beholds the fair and lovely page debauched by the ruthless and presumptuous hand of man. Thus we

find Doctor Watson without qualification or fitness to write of, or deal helpfully with the life of the most important Person in the whole universe of God. To ruthlessly forge his way into this Holy of Holies, and trample under foot the sacred and heavenly as it clusters about His sacred Person, is brutal. The beautiful and the true which his friends admire in him will not compensate for the persistent, reckless, inexcusable departure from the truth which permeates near and remote almost every part of what he presumes to call "The Life of the Master."

The realm of mystery and apparent obscurity which is common in many parts of the Divine utterance, suggests no occasion for embarrassment or hesitation to the fascinating Scotch preacher, who with ease and facility assumes to supply all the needful explanation. But "vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord"—"his mischief will return upon his own head, and his violent dealing come down upon his own pate." The danger would be small, comparatively, if his readers could be induced to place his wares in God's scales: if they could be made to line them up with a "Thus saith the Lord," then the true and the false would be apparent, but thousands accept such writings as in harmony with what is written, only to find themselves alienated from God and His most Holy Word. God has revealed all men need to know, to add to it or take from it is of the evil one.

Distinctions through priestly caste, hereditary rank or vast endowments as admired by men, had no place with Jesus Christ. Two classes confronted Him, saved and lost: those who were for Him, and those who were against Him. The latent enmity in man was awakened by God's presence in the Person of His Son, the Spirit-born and Spirit-taught believed in Him, received Him.

Half truths are all lies, and correspondingly more vicious. Jesus was not averse to respectability; His wonderful interview with Nicodemus

was as fruitful as His equally marvellous dealing with the woman of Sychar's well; faithfulness characterized Him with the Ruler of the Jews and the Samaritan adultress; neither really more susceptible to His teachings than the other. The man who came to Him by night had no more moral fitness to receive Him than the woman of Samaria, of whom He asked a drink at high noon. Jesus had but one gift to bestow upon respectable and outcast, "for there is no difference." By one man sin entered the world and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men for that all have sinned; one man brought in sin and every man begotten through him had the same characteristics; one Man brought in life, there was no life apart from Him, no one good enough without it, none too bad to be out of reach of it. "The wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life thro' Jesus Christ our Lord."

Jesus had nothing of the natural antipathy of man, who simply judged by what he could see; He hated hypocrisy and He only could see the heart; while He hated sin, He loved the sinner; when He died it was to save sinners, respectable and otherwise. Jesus proved His willingness to receive the prodigal; the elder brother pilloried himself with all the other respectables, who conspired to kill the Lord because of His readiness to save the lost. The respectables joined hands, Pharisees, Herodians, Sadducees, Romans, to compass His death because He received sinners and ate with them. The righteousness which the respectables brought to John Baptist was also brought to Jesus and rejected by Him; for in their ignorance they refused to submit themselves to the righteousness of God while they went about to establish their own righteousness. The Pharisee extolled his virtues; the Publican saw himself a sinner the one under conviction, the other in the temple of God, but not brought under the power of God, and Jesus was no more affected by the Pharisee's recital

of his virtues than by their comparison with the alleged vices of the Publican. That which pleased the Lord and justified the Publican was found in his taking his place as a sinner. In the estimation of men one was worse than the other, but they were both alike until the one took his place as a sinner. This gave him the precedence and preference with God. (Luke 19:10.) These distinctions still exist, practically the Publican was no worse than the Pharisee. Their lives, in their alienation to God, had simply taken on and reflected their environments, one in religion, the other without, both equally godless. If the Pharisee had known the hollowness of his own unreconciled, sinful nature, he never would have flattered himself and slandered his neighbor. The alleged extortion and injustice of the one, no more offensive in the sight of God than the outbreking hate and hypocrisy of the other, the conduct of the Publican not nearly so subversive of the Jewish national life as the bigotry and self-righteousness of the Pharisee who pretended to stand for God. The most despicable class in all the universe is found among those who wear religion as a cloak, but whose hypocritical lives speak louder than their profession; what they are is not what they seem; among this class are those who, in their ignorance, grade sin in the face of what is written "whatsoever is not of faith is sin" and to him who knoweth to do good, and doeth it not to him it is sin." The Pharisees condemned themselves in judging and condemning the Publicans. The Lord Jesus was not swayed for a moment by the estimate they placed upon those whom they desired to stigmatize as the "hated class," and whose unsupported ex-parte testimony Dr. Watson affects to believe and stands ever ready to give it currency. The attitude of the Pharisees toward Him who was the express image of God, and who had come out from God, furnished but a poor equipment for fitting them for sitting in the place of judge. These ultra respectable religionists, who cursed

the land "hated Him without a cause;" they covenanted with Judas for the price of a slave for the betrayal of One who came to bless and save.

Our learned doctor in his efforts to discount the testimony of Jesus, "who needed not that any should testify of man, for He knew what was in man," stands ready to degrade to the lowest human level the Publican, and elevate to the highest mortal conception the Pharisee, and this in the face of the anathemas of the Son of God, pronounced against them. John denounced them as a generation of vipers before Jesus had testified against them: what have we then? The Pharisees against the Publican; the Lord against the Pharisees! Let us examine the score; we have the character of the witnesses, whose testimony could be easily impeached; according to the slanderous attack in the temple, in the pretense of a prayer, offered by the Pharisee; it is only by inference that this part of his address could appear to involve the Publican whom he introduces this wise, and may or may not apply to him. "God I thank Thee that I am not as other men, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this Publican." For the sake of argument let us accept the whole as applying to the "hated one" who stood afar off and cried "God be merciful to me, a sinner," but who, rather than the other, went down to his house justified; after all, it is not adultery, injustice or extortion that shuts men out of heaven, but unbelief. This unbelief was the heritage of the Pharisee, while the key that unlocked the kingdom of God, and which admitted the Publican, was faith, which the religionist lacked.

There is nothing to convict Zaccheus in his confession; it was meet having received Jesus that he should confess his faith and give assurances for the future, and he does not do this as a representative of a class, but as a sinner saved

by grace; he could say what any other might, "Behold if I have taken anything from any man by false accusation, I restore four-fold."

Let us analyze the respective elements in the two classes in whom, according to God's testimony, there was no difference. The respectable was a viper, a hypocrite, a whitened sepulchre, a conspirator, betrayer, murderer, on the witness of the Word, while not a word of testimony or stigma was ever entered against the Publican by any but the Pharisee, it follows that both classes were sinners, before God; the Publicans, humanly speaking, open to conviction; the Pharisees not: the religion of the one could avail no more with God than the irreligion of the other. The taint in the blood would be found the same in both, begotten in the likeness of Adam, after his alienation and no whit an improvement over Eve's first born: no moral decency in the accuser or accused. The Pharisees in their unbelief neglected, rejected and slew the Son of God; In building the tombs of the prophets, they confessed themselves in their words (Matt. 23:31) the children of those who killed the prophets. The Pharisee despised the Publican because he was disloyal to their nation, while the Pharisee himself was disloyal to the God of that nation.

In Dr. Watson's appeal for popular favor, he introduces all sorts of vagaries into Luke 18, and undertakes to throw numerous oriental sidelights into Simon's feast as given in Luke 7. In his bid for popular applause he loses the benediction of God, for no lie is of the truth.

An altogether fair and conscientious reviewer, who undertakes to make in some degree a critical, though of necessity in this case, a somewhat superficial examination, should be intelligent in his comparisons, honest in his conclusions, charitable in his discussions, while he strives to exhibit the same gentleness in combating error, that characterized our Lord, in His wonderful interview with the woman of Sychar,

and while he gives in simplicity the results of his investigation, he must neither be broader nor narrower than the Word of God, the only rule for trying any and every utterance of men.

Now under such circumstances to speak of regrets would be incongruous, and yet to traverse so many lines, one is sure to find much that is charming, and while to be honest one must rebuke error, one confesses to occasional pangs of remorse, as he comes face to face with some sweet tribute to the homeless Nazarene by our eloquent, popular, but misleading Scotch preacher. Such pangs are but momentary, for while one is chagrined for having criticised at all, radical lines of departure from the truth claim attention, and one is convinced of the unreliability of the products of such a pen. At the threshold of the number under consideration, occasion is found for stumbling, in Dr. Watson's references to the "innocency and simplicity of the Eden state," involving also his beautiful tribute to the children, his touching words concerning Jesus and His unselfish love for the little ones.

Dr. Watson proves himself untaught in matters involving the church, for while in the mind of God it had a name and place from the foundation of the world, yet it had no visible existence among men during the days of our Lord's life in the earth. The element to whom Jesus came, and with whom He dealt directly and almost exclusively, was the Jew, one of the three divisions into which Paul, by the Holy Ghost, afterwards grouped the world. "The Jew, the Gentile and the Church of God." Jesus could not in His life deal with the church, as it grew out of His death and resurrection, and the promised enduement by the Spirit of the Father. Even after the foundation was laid for this superstructure the apostles were in obscurity as to the part which they were expected to perform, and methods peculiarly and almost exclusively Jewish, characterized what was done, until,

through persecution and other divine interpositions involving object lessons of one kind or another, they were led into God's purposes, who by the Spirit began calling out the Church from Jew and Gentile alike, who lost their identity as such, in the Church of God, as they became members of the body of Christ, and members one of another.

It would be interesting to take up and examine in the light of the Word, the Lord Jesus in His relation to the children, as described in four scenes in the Gospel, in which all sorts of unscriptural and un-Christlike things are introduced by Dr. Watson: much of fancy and less of fact, the former dominating, the latter meagre, the two misleading and corrupting, filling living temples with demoralizing and debasing error, which might otherwise be adorned with gracious, life-giving, life sustaining, God-glorifying truths, drawn in their freshness from God's store-house, suited to the needs of each particular one; salvation and healing to the sinner, instruction and comfort to sons. Man's conceptions are but stumbling blocks in the way of the sinner, hurtful, distressing error for the saint.

We shall examine somewhat, in the light of Scripture, the arguments of Dr. Watson in relation to the three classes which he has chosen to represent by three notable characters introduced into the sacred page by the Holy Ghost, but used by our inventive doctor along lines which have no foundation in the facts, as set forth in the divine Record. Nathaniel, Nicodemus and Zaccheus, critic, formalist and sinner, are made to serve purposes and do service in a strange and unique way. Born in the brain of this candidate for popularity, it had been better had they "died a borning," rather than that boys and girls get their impressions of God and these New Testament worthies, in this uncertain caricature of that which is holy.

The only scriptural premise laid for making a critic out of Nathaniel, is found in John 1:46,

"Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" So far as we have it in the Word of God, Philip preaches the gospel of the Old Testament to Nathaniel, identifies Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph, with the promised Messiah; to which Nathaniel hesitates apparently but a brief moment, asks one simple question, and straightway responds to the invitation of Philip, "Come and see." This man of letters attempts to build out of a chimera a colossal edifice of pure fiction, the objective point being to prove Nathaniel a critic like himself.

To Nicodemus he assigns the role of "formalist," in an equally gratuitous way, tells us "that he was the most honest Pharisee Jesus met," "that this meeting took place at his first visit to Jerusalem," "that he had a reputation for theology." Zaccheus stands for the sinner, even tho' nowhere in the Word are Publican and sinner found synonomous, the Holy Spirit usually coupling the Publican and the sinner together, which would not be found so, if they could be used interchangeably or were identical in meaning.

Dr. Watson very kindly gives us the hitherto unknown details in the life of Nathaniel, tells us where he lived, what he was, his standing and habits, that he stood aloof from the movements of John the Baptist, and why: that Philip did go to the Jordan because there were a multitude; one a mystic, the other a man of affairs. That Nathaniel was a "quiet, modest, diffident, questioning person, and he stayed at home." "gathering what was written about the Messiah in Scripture, accumulating, comparing, reconciling evidence, and creating a portrait which would satisfy his reason, and by which he would identify the coming One." To reconcile evidence to meet one's reason, has in it none of the characteristics of faith; faith believes, does not reconcile; searching for proof, comparing Scripture with Scripture, help'ul; but the microscope and knife are not the instruments

for helpful, restful research, but suggest something lacking in the record,—hints of supplemental work through reason, the introduction of natural law and the application of science in the spiritual world. We are told that Nathaniel was learned, speculative, conscientious, and that he would see Jesus for himself: but for Philip, who hears and believes, a simple child of faith, the great doctor has no kindly mention. That which pleased God does not give pleasure to Doctor Watson, while Nathaniel, the doctor would have us believe, was occupied with his senses in perplexity and sadness, adjusting that which was written, discounting the Messiah's claim on him: he finds no help from uncritical Philip, who is so easily satisfied, and hence no criterion for him. His estimate of the ancient, honored, the oldest and best Book is seen in this query, "and yet is the question of Jesus to be settled by the ancient books? There is not an element in this sketch of Nathaniel in harmony with the Divine record.

The only way out of darkness into light is by faith; reason as remote as a means to this end as the silly nonsense of a congress of religions. Jesus will satisfy no man who will not believe in Him. The Pharisees got nothing from Him: Mary found everything to meet her every need in Him. Faith always, reason never, brings the sinner en rapport with Jesus Christ. Deliverance from sin, its power and its penalty, comes through simple, child-like faith in the crucified and risen One, and no other way. The simple and the critic go in at the same door, and the former is not retarded by his lack of mind, the latter not helped by his superabundance.

We now come to the consideration of the pen portrait of Nicodemus, "the formalist," by this untrustworthy caricaturist, who prostitutes the Word of God as a presumable basis for "The Life of the Master," but who ignores what is written and substitutes his own ideas

in the place of God's words. The Holy Ghost gives all we can possibly know of this "man of the Pharisees,—name, office, time and interview of Jesus, the conversation of John three; the brief word of John seven; a supplemental line or more in John nineteen. This satisfies the child of faith, who is fully persuaded that all he needs to know has been revealed by the Spirit, and for the learned doctor to intimate "that Nicodemus would miss a certain academic flavor in Jesus' speech dear unto scholars," is but to fling into the face of the omniscient Christ an insult too base to be chronicled; such sacrilege is without precedent, save in the mouths of the profane and vile. This covert attack upon the divinity of our Lord obscures all the pretty touches found in the preceding papers. The divine man who shocked Nicodemus with his provincialisms, this irreverend and unsafe teacher inconsistently tells us in another place "knew the thoughts of the Pharisees and confused them in His dealings with them." Doctor Watson forestalls what is written on the sacred pages as he injects his faulty words into the face of Him who knew all things; for Nicodemus without fear or favor, confessed himself to be in the presence of one who came from God, and who had God with Him, which while not up to the mark, was at least greatly in advance of the one who dares to write this parody upon the life of the Master. Who but Doctor Watson would dare to insinuate that God would even send an untutored man to earth to represent Him, much less that this was He who came out from God with all His attributes who could be trammelled by weakness or ignorance? Nicodemus found no occasions for criticism, no child of faith dare hint at failure anywhere in Jesus. He heard Jesus' words, he believed them. The "how can these things be" of Nicodemus in keeping with the woman of John four "from whence then hast thou this living water?"

Both are scholars in the same school with the same Teacher, at different time and place, drinking in their simplicity, at the same fountain; one a Pharisee, the other an adulteress; and "there is no difference," for without Christ one is no more lost than the other, but one channel to Himself, opened up by Himself, by which in His own way both may have access through faith.

Jesus, "the provincial," propounded the most profound truths ever uttered; no such words ever fell upon the ears of this Ruler of the Jews before; but we know nothing of his past, his attitude toward empty rights, hackneyed phrases, barren methods, etc. Still we are told that "one honest man recognizes another." Was it only a man whom Nicodemus met? Do the facts given prove according to John seven that this ruler of the Jews was bound to act in concert with his colleagues?

The paper under consideration is out of harmony with that which is written; errors read in, truths read out; the divine utterance marred by misstatement, the casual reader mislead, the little one offended, God dishonored, man deified, as entertainment is furnished for the thoughtless and ignorant; no one edified, stumbling blocks of satanic make and mould injected ruthlessly into the pathway of the unwary pilgrim, through misrepresentation to trip the feet of God's little ones. Nicodemus became a believer and learner when born into God's family; Jesus preached the Word, the man of the Pharisees believed the message, passed from death unto life. Nathaniel was a sinner, as was Nicodemus and Zaccheus, no more, no less, born the same way, under condemnation, without Christ, without hope; the same measure of guilt secured equal judgment through the penalty of a law given by the hands of a sin hating God: there was no reaching out after God in either apart from the Spirit. The first

Adam brought them nothing to help them Godward. What is your relation to the second man, the Lord from heaven?

The name of Zaccheus occurs three times in Luke only, all that is known of him is told in ten brief verses of less than forty lines. The last verse of the ten is the key that unlocks the mystery of the life of our Lord in the earth. The seeking Saviour looks for and finds Zaccheus; the latter does not find Je-us. As usual the imagination plays the most important part in the sketch of this interesting character as given by our writer; as a matter of fact we cannot surely know an antecedent incident in the life of Zaccheus, whether practically he was worse or better than his class, nor the attitude of the thronging multitude, then, or before. We do know that he received Jesus; that he came down out of the sycamore tree in obedience to the command of Jesus, and further that he received Him joyfully, we surely know just what this involves from John 1:12; and that his confession is the first aspiration of the new life, which by faith in the Son of God he has but just now begun to live. The closing thought of the paper before us is not in harmony with God's way of putting things. As long as Zaccheus was unreconciled to Jesus he could present no attraction to the Lord of life and glory, save as he drew forth compassion from the blessed Son of God, as Jesus found him in weakness and sin. Zaccheus was saved because he believed in Jesus, not because Jesus believed in him.

Giving the sense of Scripture is incomparably vicious; the finite tampering with the Infinite, a potent evil, misleading millions as it lays the foundation for deceiving unborn millions more. Traditional rendering is increasingly popular, because the mind of man is ever more acceptable to men than the mind of God; human ingenuity is needed to blunt its force and effect, and crush out the life-giving principle con-

tained in the message as it comes from its divine source. Men instructed in the Word will rarely, if ever, undertake to give the signification for the very reason that they prize the Word of God too highly to undertake to mar its beauty by an error; haphazard methods may commend themselves to men, but an immortal soul must not be jeopardized by an incorrect rendering of God's unique message to man. The Lord may dignify man in using him as a messenger, but it is that he may bear the Lord's message, not a grouping of words, an admixture of the human and divine, purporting to be what it is not, but a communication from the Infinite One. To mislead a soul in the careless misuse of words is reprehensible, but to deliberately read the divine out and the human into God's testimony, is God dishonoring and soul destroying. Perhaps nowhere in modern literature can be found such flagrant departure from what is written on the sacred pages as characterizes Dr. John Watson, with his disjointed, disconnected, emasculated, broken paragraphs, pieced out from scripture to suit the case, and given as a premise for his so-called "Life of the Master," as in the role of a romancer he ventures into sacred precincts already hallowed by the presence of one who spake as never man spake. But what shall we say of deliberate falsification, interpolation, emasculation but that it is the corrupting trail of the serpent, and infinitely more God dishonoring than a mere slip of the tongue, or the utterance of one who ignorantly affects to give the sense? These papers under review reek with silly sentiment, unsavory and nauseating, demoralizing thousands of superficial readers, who are perhaps to get their first and only impression of God as they find it issue from the false and uncertain lines of one who is seeking the applause of men, and apparently does not court the divine benediction.

We are told that "one rich man after another stands out in his place and can be identified." The first (he says) is given without disguise, because he was an acquaintance of His, and figured in a romantic incident." This twaddle the untaught will accept as truth, because of the holy calling of this reverend writer. We are told again that this young Ruler was from the country, belonging to the higher class in society, father wealthy, character of good principles and solid worth quickened by spiritual ideas, unworldly instincts, fine vein of enthusiasm and a habit of self-forgetfulness, which were very taking; again, born heir to dangerous advantages and competing temptations, he was neither a profligate nor a prig, but a well-liking, cultivated, high spirited, reverent gentleman." Discriminating readers will see at once the need of subjecting these lines to careful scrutiny and painstaking comparison with that which "is written," for the manner of the man makes it all the more necessary that his words shall be truth, for thousands of superficial readers much prefer to accept scripture references second-hand. Not considering their value nor demanding marks of genuineness; and thus it comes to pass that what might be a stepping stone Godward into an eternity of blessing, degenerates into stumbling blocks over which men are cast into perdition. Brilliant, but blind, is our Scotch author, eloquent as Apollos, perverse as Elymas; but we can only glance at these pictures thrown upon the canvas by this master in fictitious art.

The second rich man we are told "is a very unlovely character;" as one gathers from his increase in wealth and coarseness in tone, he had not been heir to riches and position, as was the young Ruler, and he had not, therefore, his fine instincts and graciousness;" he speaks with freedom of his "hard struggle from poverty to affluence, a progress not from knowl-

edge to knowledge, nor from character to character, but from barn to barn." And so the uninteresting, unlikely details are read into this life of this fool of whom his soul had been required. The reviewer has no disposition to cavil at the steps that this lover of money is made to take in his rise from poverty to riches, but of the audacity which presumes to supply a bill of particulars where the Divine Penman is silent.

"The third man of riches is a stronger figure and a more complicated character" we are told; also that "he was not a sordid wretch, like the man of barns," "nor a student like the young Ruler, but he rather stands for the luxury and magnificence of riches," "no leisure for private charity," "but there was in him a generous heart," "would have done kindly things if he had thought; so great that he did not notice a beggar," "among his easy environments his imagination had died," "could not put himself in his brother's place, etc." But our author passes by the wonderful scene portrayed by our Lord and throws his own false sketch upon the canvas, which suffers by comparison; the changes wrought as the result of their changed conditions is glossed over; the hell and torment of the one; the convoy of the angels and the goal in Abraham's bosom of the other. In the false conception of Rev. Watson the fire that is to shake this victim of prosperity out of self and set him free from the grip of riches and their insidious and deadening power is apparently an influence brought into his life rather than a fixed condition in death.

According to Dr. Watson, the wonderful words spoken by our Lord with reference to "a certain rich man" (without a name) and a certain beggar named Lazarus" separated by a great gulf fixed" do not suggest any particular difficulty, tho' the one that had received his good things and he that had received evil things have changed places for all eternity; but

the doctor, true to his bent, gives it no consideration; nothing of the water, of the torment, the flame; nothing of sending the once despised beggar, now comforted, as one from the dead back to his father's house to warn his brothers lest they also come into this place of torment; nothing of Abraham's tribute to the authority and value of the Word as found in Moses and the Prophets over and above the testimony of one rising from the dead.

This "Life of the Master" is fiction; it reflects the man Watson, not the man Christ. The truth he passes over and the fancy he throws in proves him as holding lightly to that which is divine in the Son of God, but revelling always and everywhere where a loose rein can be thrown to the imagination. Read "The Life of the Master" by all means, but with an open Bible before you; compare every utterance of Doctor Watson with what is found written there; form your own estimate of the value of such work as has been wrought by this fancy monger. But behold three men ruined not by "fastidious refinement, coarse greed or unrestrained luxury," but through the love of money, issuing from being born wrong, and going wrong from birth and ending up in rejecting God's only way of salvation through Christ. The rich young Ruler under law heard the message, from the Law Giver, rejected it; the rich man of Luke sixteen had Moses and the prophets, but he rejected God's way through them; all laid up treasure toward themselves and neither were rich toward God.

The Holy Spirit's words are unmatched in kind, excellence and signification in their connection. This whole unique testimony, the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, comprehending in its singularity all the mind of God, as expressed in the Holy Scriptures in Words of His choice, and each particular letter chosen by Himself with which He intended to form a part of speech, as the symbol

of His own thoughts; its true meaning often incomprehensible apart from its setting, and altogether meaningless to man when viewed as an abstraction, or when associated with things not germane. It is God's message to man, to be received, believed, applied, lived; to be tested by the application of its precepts and promises in the life, but not to be discussed; neither is it to be woven into fiction to give it character. The men who penned it could only do so as borne along by the Spirit; the men who expound it powerless apart from the Divine Author. Dr. John Watson gives half truths in disjointed excerpts, in his own words, and succeeds in robbing God of honor; the Book of glory, as he saps the life out of what is found Written on the sacred page. This world which slew the Son of God is a religious world; occupied with the form, they deny the power; if the message smacks of religion they concern themselves precious little about the Scripture connection, or literality. A magazine may quadruple its issue because it contains a semi-religious story without any significance whatever, as to the character of the story, or the motive of the subscribers. Pious phrases are more or less acceptable in proportion to the state of the physical health.

The semi-religious worldling boasts of his liberality, his breadth of charity. The Bible Christian demands literality, the inerrant Word, the only safe channel of communication between God and man, he declines to accept reasons estimate and application, counts it unsafe as a means to an end, and insists that the Word of God is the only authoritative rule for the life which now is, and that which furnishes equipment for the life which is to come.

The paper before us opens in language without scriptural sanction, as follows: "It is inevitable that any prophet who sets himself to regenerate society shall face the problem of riches." Our writer and the unregenerated

blind beggar of John nine agree in according Jesus the place of a prophet; hence a mere man, though after receiving his sight the man blind from his birth does not worship Him. But when Jesus propounded those searching words, "Dost thou believe on the Son of God?" he quickly responds, "Who is He, Lord, that I might believe on Him?" Jesus answers, "Thou hast both seen Him, and it is He that talketh with thee." And he said, "Lord, I believe," and he worshipped Him. Recovering of sight to his eyes he traces to a prophet. To a being worthy of his faith, he accords worship. Jesus said of John the Baptist, "Yea, I say unto you (he is) much more than a prophet." John says of Jesus, "I saw and bear record that this is the Son of God." No Scripture data can be given to prove that Jesus came to regenerate society. Jesus did not deal with the mass, but with the individual, often in solitary places, at night, at noonday, alone. Jesus was in no sense a reformer; out of the mass of corrupting, sinning humanity, Jesus came to call men, individuals to repentance; He could do nothing for the ninety and nine, but He could go after that which was lost until He finds it; He could lay it on His shoulders with rejoicing and bring it home. Men needing salvation must be dealt with as units; society is soulless; the burning question is "what shall a MAN give in exchange for his soul?"

The problem of riches was easily solved by the all-knowing One. He only knew how corrupting a force gold would become in alienating men from their Maker. The poverty of the poor not nearly so soul destroying as the wealth of the rich. Jesus, the Maker and upholder of the world, was the possessor of it all; He was rich, yet for our (your) sakes became poor, that we (ye), through His poverty, might be rich. There was no comparisons drawn by Him as to His surroundings as set over against the rich; if "His duty led Him into the houses of the

rich people," it is preposterous to suppose that "He was made to feel in many ways that an invitation to a rich man's house was an honor to be thankfully and humb'y used." He recognized no justly distinguishing marks according pre-eminence because of riches; it was not the honor and distinction which great possessions brought men that awed and humbled Jesus, but the hurtful effect upon their own souls which He well knew was inevitable, and that the love of money was almost sure to follow the aggregation of wealth. We have no means of knowing that Simon, the Pharisee of the seventh chapter of Luke, was rich, or even in different circumstances from Jesus' mother; it was not his wealth or lack of it that caused him to withhold the common courtesies: it was the same ignorance and unbelief which today robs Jesus of divinity and refuses to accord our divine Lord that measure of homage which flowed out in spontaneity through the tears of that hitherto sinful, though now repentant woman, who stood at His feet behind Him, weeping and washing His feet with her tears, and in contradistinction to the treatment accorded the Lord of life and glory made in the likeness of sinful flesh by Dr. John Watson in his effort to produce a life of the Master.

Again we read, "It is laid on His heart to speak to the rich as no prophet has done since." Jesus spoke as God, knowing the end from the beginning, not with the envy born of covetousness, nor with the reproach and invective—born of silly thoughts about the relative conditions existing between classes because of scant or abundant resources. It was not the riches of the rich nor the poverty of the poor which occupied Jesus, only as in the former case it was seen to be inevitably a stumbling block in the way of Godliness, and a snare in devouring all hope in time for an eternity with God. Jesus proves His coming to deal with individuals in His dealings with the rich. In the case

of the rich young Ruler, many false lines are read into his life, in the face of his decision to reject the answer of Jesus to his question as to what he should do to inherit eternal life. Dr. Watson tells us "that he was a reverent gentleman, one to whom Providence may well give riches and who may be rich with safety." He declines to obey Jesus, but good Dr. Watson commends him. he tells us "he would be weary unto death of the religion of the day and the insincerity of the religious people." The young Ruler may have had an admiration for the Lord, but he had no faith in Him, nor use for His Words: he may have been too courteous to refuse Him water for His feet had He been a guest, but he turns away in sadness from the Lord of life and glory to his corrupting possessions and allowed them to crowd out all thoughts of eternal life. He might yield the lowly Galilean an empty civility through a servant, but will not accord his personal allegiance if it cost a sacrifice. Dr. Watson is so enamored with the man whom he clothes with such refinement and virtues that he stoops, by way of comparison, to pay a gratuitous insult to Peter and Matthew, "neither," says he, "having souls of special refinement," and yet they followed Jesus to the end: while this Ruler "of finer clay" prefers his gold to his God.

Jesus, who was very man and very God, had no disappointment to conceal at the refusal of the young Ruler; Jesus knew what his decision would be: it was not for His sake that the test was made, but that the young Ruler and all about him might behold the seductive power that bound the young man, siren like, to the promethan rock which was to work his absolute undoing.

Dr. Watson, as a reasoner, is an absolute failure, and the problems he works out and the lessons he deduces from the scripture narrative of the rich young Ruler, proves him absolutely incapable of rightly dividing the Word of truth;

his word painting cannot save this money lover with his presumably single, serious, fatal lack, with his back to the Son of God; he in no wise differed in his "fastidious refinement" from the one "of greed" or the one of "unrestrained luxury."

This trio made equally notorious by Scripture mention, diverse in habit, but one in selfish aim and greedy purpose, stand out conspicuously as representatives of the class to which they belong. The same genus, with different characteristics.

Truth stands unmoved as a mighty bulwark against which the errors of the ages have beaten in vain, for truth is real, in conformity to fact; any want of adherence to established rule, is error; any statement that does not possess the elements of exactness is unreliable: verity is not chimera; if communications between men must be free from exaggeration, it is of infinite moment that a restatement of God's unique record shall be characterized by Scriptural accuracy.

Any title conferred by man upon his fellow, betokening isolation and a supposed official relation to God, suggests increased responsibility assumed, and demands that every utterance embracing the heavenly message shall be but a conscientious iteration. It is a well known fact that men presuming to stand for the Deity, whether in Christian or anti-Christian countries, appear to some to be panoplied with a certain glamour which not only magnifies the office, but seems to give authority to the utterance. All will admit this statement susceptible of proof, hence the title "reverend," is accepted as a guaranty of faithfulness in the discharge of presumed heavenly functions. If this claimant for confidence corrupts the message of which he is simply the bearer, he bears the same relation to those to whom he ministers that a defunct surety company's bond does to its patrons. Every word inspired by God, the Holy Ghost, and "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God," involves the highest conception of authority of the

triune God—Father, Son and Holy Ghost. To touch it at any point is to mar it, to add to it, to take from it is but to suffer the just wrath of a righteous God, whose unique words are all pervasive, all wise, all powerful.

The number now under consideration, abounds in flagrant departures from the truth. We are informed that He (Jesus) stayed at John's modest lodging in Jerusalem, as well as used the "upper room" of a wealthier friend; we are told of the room in the Publican's house in Capernaum which was made sacred because Jesus had feasted there, and sealed, as in a sacrament, the salvation of Levi. "The romance of Bethany" is, perhaps, the silliest of all his senseless productions, where Simon, the Pharisee of Luke VII, is through a judgment for his lack of courtesy and his hardness and exclusiveness toward Jesus made to become Simon, the leper, of Mark XIV; and thought to be father of Lazarus, Martha and Mary. In the house of the later Simon, Martha is made to amend her father's lack of hospitality; Mary is so affected with the unbidden, sinful, weeping woman at Simon, the Pharisee's house, that she will annoint Jesus also, His head and His feet, in the house of Simon, the leper (her father). Dr. Watson would have us believe Simon, the "Pharisee," as separated from his friends and his family, stricken with the symbol of sin, the awful scourge of leprosy, which compelled him to leave his home, his city, his associates, his children, and pass into seclusion," and this is what the careless reader is to be wheedled into accepting, led captive by Satan at his will, who stands in the forefront ready to abet every effort to rob God of His glory in reducing the force and effect of His Most Holy Word.

There is nothing really known of the personnel of the New Testament which is not found written there; to add to it or to take from it is to cast insult into the face of God. "But vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord."

If changing the force and effect of man's words may prove a misdemeanor, how much more heinous to corrupt the Word of God. Such an attitude toward the Word of God suggests a failure to comprehend Him. The men who esteem it incomplete and susceptible of improvement at their hands, rush with unseemly haste into the very presence of God and with audacious effrontery inject their silly supplemental paragraphs into what they esteem defective.

"The destruction of the poor is their poverty." With rare exception poverty is thought to stand an insuperable obstacle to advancement. The Son of Man and those possessing His Spirit refuse to recognize the distinctions which wealth suggests. In the bill of items embraced in the message delivered by our Lord to the disciples of John the Baptist for his comfort and their instruction, perhaps nothing was fraught with more interest than the seventh and closing thought, "to the poor the gospel is preached." This would reassure John, for this, too, was in harmony with the prophetic utterance.

The glamour of wealth has a far reaching influence with our learned doctor. If inherited, "it was the symbol of refinement and gentleness;" "if the issue of toil and business effort, it stood for coarse greed;" but the man with money possessed a potent factor quick to win his way to the heart of the author. Money made possible, in his estimation, culture and refinement. These were paramount. The danger associated with riches, though magnified by our Lord, suggests no occasion for worryment with Dr. Watson.

The Lord loved sinners. He came, the expression of God's love; He recognized no man-made distinctions. Rich men were not noted in the record as quick to cast in their lot with the One of whom it was said "the foxes have holes, the birds of the air have nests, but the Son of Man hath not where to lay His head." When the disciples went to their homes, Jesus went to

the Mount of Olives. "If a penny is needed to illustrate His answer to a question, He had to ask for one; when the temple tax is wanted, a miracle provides it. It was with the rich in His death," because it was written. "He came to seek and to save that which was lost"—the poor, the maimed, the blind, humanly speaking, more susceptible to the Spirit's wooing. His dealings with the blind beggar of John IX, gives us some of the sweetest episodes in His life. It was just before reaching Jericho, and at the time of Jesus' wonderful discovery of the little rich sinner in the sycamore tree, that He blessed a blind beggar. Jesus gave the best He brought to the poor; He was not dazzled by the rich, but He withheld nothing from them which they were willing to receive. It might be pertinent in asking what would Jesus do, to question whether He would speak a few pious words in a hovel and permit the mourners in their sorrow to bear their dead to the Silent City alone, while spending days in preparing to laud some Christless rich because of their money.

Our learned Scotchman's rhapsodies over "the rich young Ruler" and his apologies for "the unrestrained luxury" of him of Luke XVI, proves his susceptibility to the power of wealth. Riches may prove the sad undoing of both, but their votaries receive much more attention than the blind beggar of John IX, and the lowly fisherman whom Jesus dignified by calling them to be with and near Him. Dr. Watson commiserates and excuses the rich young Ruler in his rejection of Jesus because of his riches, which he esteems a virtue, compared to the fishing boat which Peter gave up when he came to Jesus, or the custom house which Matthew deserted, when he left it to follow the Lord. The "ingenuous prayer of the young ruler was no prayer, it was a question. Jesus loved him as He loved every other sinner who needed eternal life, not for his nobility. Nicodemus, his peer, needed to be born again. The young Ruler, a self-righteous

Pharisee, who loved his money more than discipleship, professed to have kept all the commandments, while his decision proved he had not kept the first; but he had riches, and this excused him, even though he prefers his money to everlasting life. A cultured life, and "assured position" go far with the doctor to condone the offense, and his hero is made to sink into the pit with his social equals, men of the same habit as himself, rather than enter into life with men his peers, save in dollars. "He wanted an atmosphere of refinement, freedom from petty cares; it would be a shame that he be asked to reduce himself to poverty and become companion of fishermen, whose ways were not his ways, and wander about the country who had lived in a home." From a human standpoint thousands beholding only the life which is, might be excused for refusing to give up their possessions, but Jesus was dealing with eternal interests, and there was nothing in the fleeting pleasures which dollars would bring, compared with the divine benediction here and eternity with God hereafter.

The rich young Ruler under law desires to know what he shall do to inherit eternal life, and it is only on this principle that Jesus tells him to keep the commandments.

FREE ON APPLICATION

Also by same author.

	Pages
"Inspiration,"	32
"The Word of God"	4
"The Lord's Day,"	4
"All Not of Grace Goes,"	16
"Pulpit, Pew, Hell," Etc.	48
"Dry Bones,"	4
"Christian Living and Giving,"	16
"Two Natures," Etc	32
"And It Was Night,"	4
"Christianity vs. Judaism."	32
"The Lord's Supper,"	8

Address

EDWIN A. WILSON,
Springfield, Illinois.

BS2420 .W747

Review of Rev. John Watson's Life of the

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00052 4597